NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET. JAMES GORDON BENNETT. PROPRIETOR.

ABUSEMENTS THIS EVENING. WOOD'S MUSEUM, Broadway, corner 30th st.-Per-BOWERY THEATRE, BOWERY.-WITCHES OF NEW YORK-MY PELLOW CLERK. OLYMPIC THEATRE, Broadway.-THE BALLET PAN

BOOTH'S THENTRE, Twenty-third street, corner Sixth UNION SQUARE THEATRE, Fourteenth st. and Broadway. The Vokes Farily-Bellies of the Kitchen, &c. WALLACK'S THEATRE, Broadway and 13th street.-LINA EDWIN'S THEATRE, 720 Broadway .- Pool of the Family -- Wanted a Father, &c.

PIFTH AVENUE THEATRE, Twenty-fourth street.-

MRS. P. B. CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE. PARK THEATRE, opposite City Hall, Brooklyn.-THEATRE COMIQUE, 514 Broadway -Comic Vocal-SAN FRANCISCO HALL, 585 Brondway. -SAN SHARP

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE, No. 201 Bowery.-CENTRAL PARK GARDEN.-GRAND INSTRUMENTAL

PAVILION, No. 688 Broadway, near Fourth st.-Grand STEINWAY HALL, Fourteenth street.-Matinee at 2-NEW YORK MUSEUM OF ANATOMY, 618 Broadway.-

TRIPLE SHEET.

New York, Thursday, May 16, 1872.

CONTENTS OF TO-DAY'S HERALD.

PAGE.

1—Advertisements.

2—Advertisements.

3—The Democratic State Convention at Rochester:

Hofman and Greeley Masters of the Field—
The Loyal Republican State Convention at Elmira: Grant and the Administration Enthusiastically Endorsed—The Greeley Liberals:

Manifesto from the Liberal Republican State Committee—The Tennessee Republican State Committee—The Tennessee Republican State

Manifesto from the Liberal Republican State Committee—The Tennessee Republican State Convention.

The Surrender: The Chamber of Commerce Signing the Capitulation to England; A Pedier Bourgeoisie That Likes the Shylock Eargain: Their Ducats Worth the Nation's Honor: Delmar Divines the Face Behind the Mask; Grant, the Unconditional Surrenderist; Royal Pheips, a Noble Democrat, Votes "No"—The Strikes: The Carpenters Nearly All Returned to Work; Strike of the Stair and Cabinetmakers.

Financial and Commercial: Reviving the Treaty; Simultaneous Influence in the London and New York Markets; Gold Down Here, Eonds Up There; Purchase of \$3,000,000 Five-Twenties by Secretary Boutwell; Pacific Mait; Text of the Law Authorizing a Reduction of the Capital Stock and Prescribing the Qualification of Directors; Governments Firm, Railway Mortgages and Southern Securities Quiet and Stendy; Money Easy, Poreign Exchange Unchanged; Treasury Balances—Disease and Dirt: Increase of Smallpox in the City; Alleged Impurity of the Croton Water—Proceedings in the New York and Brooklyn Courts.

Editorials: Leading Article, "The British—Editorials: Leading

and Brooklyn Courts.

C-Editorials: Leading Article, "The British Assault Upon the Honor of the Republic—The Imperative Duty of the American Senate"— Amusement Announcements.
7—The Jugglers' Treaty—Cable Telegrams from
England, France and Spain—News from Wastiington—Miscellaneous Telegraph—Business

Notices.

8-Kentucky Association: Third Day of the Spring Meeting: Large and Enthusiastic Attendance—Trotting at Fleetwood Park—Trotting and Racing in California—Art Matters—Marriages and Deaths—Advertisements.

9-Advertisements.

10-Connecticut: Election of General Ferry to the United States Senate by the Liberal Republicans and Democrais—Shipping Intelligence—Advertisements.

11-Advertisements.

Ter mere Topary Go if it must but let us preserve our national honor.

Humble Ple for Brother Jonathan. "IN CONSIDERATION THEREOF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, BY AND WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE THEREOF. CONSENTS THAT HE WILL MAKE NO CLAIM ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES IN RESPECT OF INDIRECT LOSSES AS AFORESAID BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF ARBITRATION AT GENEVA."-Extract from Proposed Supplemental Treaty.

Will the American Senators, republican or democratic, swallow the unclean morsel?

THE DUKE DE NOAILLES, who has just been gazetted as French Minister to Washington, bears a name as illustrious as any which occurs In the history of the monarchy of France. He is at the same moment a sincere and consistent republican.

THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES DO NOT CARE A STRAW for the Treaty of Washington. It is an English treaty-not an American one. It was made at the solicitation of England. It is valuable to the English, and not to Americans, except to a few direct claimants, speculators and commercial fossils. Shall we sacrifice the national honor to preserve such a treaty because England bullies us and threatens to destroy it?

THE ENTERPRISE OF THE HERALD.-There was a great demand for the Henald at Washington yesterday. The exclusive publication in yesterday's issue of the entire correspondence on the Alabama claims dispute took all the old diplomatic fossils by surprise and delighted the live politicians. The Senate was in an uproar, and Senator Cameron was resolved to offer resolutions of investigation to find out how the HERALD manages to get the news. He will, probably, discover what he seeks about the time the John Bull supplemental rule is accepted by our government, and not sooner. However, Senator Cameron is too shrewd and too enterprising himself to take to heart any supposed infringement of the dignity of his committee in the commendable pursuit of information for the people.

IN THE BRITISH HOUSE OF COMMONS, on the 6th of last February, Premier Gladstone said "he could, if he desired, refer to the preposterous character of the American demands, which of itself proved their absurdity; for they were such as no people in the last extremity of war or in the lowest depths of national misfortune, with the spirit of the people of England in their hearts, would ever submit to.' The House loudly cheered these remarks; but how much more lustily would John Bull use his lungs if the Premier could rise in his seat and announce that the "spirit of the people of England" had compelled the Americans to abandon their "preposterous and absurd claims," and to confess, by that cowardly act, "that they should never have been made."

WE have had quite enough of weak fish. ielly fish and Spanish mackerel in our diThe British Assault Upon the Honor of the Republic-The Imperative Duty of the American Senate.

The great journalistic enterprise which yes-

terday morning placed before the people of the United States, exclusively in the columns of the NEW YORK HERALD, the entire correspondence between the British and American governments on the subject of the case submitted by the latter to the Geneva Conference, has brought to the knowledge of the country sooner than the politicians expected or desired the details of the negotiations in which we have been engaged and the character of the final proposition offered to us by England as a settlement of the controversy she has forced upon us. In consequence of the grave importance of the subject we republish to-day the cable despatches embraced in the later corres pondence. A perusal of these documents will expose to the world more clearly than ever the unreasonableness of the concessions demanded by the English government under the threat of a repudiation of a treaty made at its own solicitation, and will confirm the popular faith on this side of the Atlantic in the justice and propriety of our hitherto professed determination to insist upon the consideration of the American case by the Geneva Tribunal as prepared by ourselves, and not as mutilated by England. Although the leading points embraced in the diplomatic correspondence have long been known, it needed the publication of Earl Granville's letter of March 20 to show us the actual weakness of his position. Every argument he uses to justify the dilatory protest of his government against our claims for indirect damages is successfully met and refuted by Secretary Fish. Lord Granville declares that these claims were heard of officially by Her Britannic Majesty for the first time in the American case, as being included in the "Alabama claims," which had theretofore been understood to embrace only the direct claims of American citizens for the depredations of the Anglo-Confederate privateers; but Secretary Fish shows that, although the indirect claims were never formulated by our government, they were advanced and alluded to in almost every official communication on the Alabama controversy, from the note of Mr. Adams to Lord Russell in November, 1862, down to the date of the Reverdy Johnson Treaty, and were specifically considered and discussed by the Joint High Commissioners by whom the Treaty of Washington was framed. Lord Granville refers to the waiver by the British High Commissioners of the Canadian claims against the United States for injuries suffered from Fenian raids, partly in consequence of the "constructive character" of a portion of such claims, and thinks Her Majesty's government were justified in expecting that after this concession the constructive or indirect claims of the United States were in like manner to be waived; but Secretary Fish reminds His Lordship that "what are termed the concessions of Great Britain appear in the treaty," and pertinently asks "if the relinquishment by the United States of a part of their claim was the equivalent therefor, why is not that set forth" in the treaty also? But we do not propose to follow the course

of the argument in all its turnings and windings. It is of little interest now to the American people to note the singular diplomatic blunder made by Lord Granville in advancing as one of the reasons for the belief of his government that the indirect claims were not a proper subject of reference to the Geneva Tribunal the fact that Minister Schenck was present in the British Parliament when both His Lordship and the Earl of Derby declared in debate that those claims were not embraced in the scope of the treaty, and that he failed to make a protest against such interpretation of the instrument. Secretary Fish sufficiently exposes the absurdity of this special plea by reminding the British Minister that the utterances in Parliament are privileged; that if the representatives of foreign Powers are bound to take notice of them they have the right to remonstrate against them, which would destroy the independence of a Parliamentary government; and that had Minister Schenck interfered, either to remonstrate or demand explanation, he would have exposed himself to the just rebuke which the United States have ere now had occasion to administer to "diplomatic agents of foreign governments who, in ignorance or in disregard of the fundamental principles of a constitutional government with an independent Legislature, have asked explanations from this government concerning the debates and proceedings of Congress." These and other points in the controversy seem only like so much mockery, in view of the humiliating knowledge that while we have altogether the best of the argument-while reason and justice are on our side-we weaken before the superior boldness of the English statesmen and degrade ourselves by entertaining for an instant their insolent demand for our unconditional surrender. No one who reads the correspondence can escape the conviction that the British government have been driven into their opposition to our case by a political necessity; that they know the indirect claims to have been made a proper subject for arbitration through the remissness of their High Commissioners, and that they have from the first been seeking by threats and bluster to drive us from a position they cannot honorably assail. The treaty they endanger is nothing to us and everything to them; the

settlement they repudiate is of their own

seeking and has never been wholly acceptable to us; yet, through the timidity or incapacity of our diplomatic officers, we are put on the defensive instead of acting on the aggressive, and instead of saying boldly the English government, "There is and by it we stand-fulfil your obligations and go before the Geneva Tribunal, or we tear the treaty into tatters," we find ourselves debating whether at the dictation of Lord Granville we shall abandon our case, confess that we advanced unjustifiable claims and acknowledge ourselves a nation of pettifogging tricksters.

The question now under discussion in the

Senate is, Shall we accept or reject a supple-

mental rule to be embodied as one of the arti-

eles of the Treaty of Washington, which,

after setting forth the contentions of England,

first, that the indirect claims presented in

our case were not included in the treaty; and,

econd, should not be admitted in principle

as growing out of the acts committed by the

Anglo-Confederate privateers; and, after agree-

ing on both sides that this principle shall govern

future similar cases, declares that, "in consideration thereof, the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, consents that he will make no claim on the part of the United States in respect of indirect losses, as aforesaid, before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva?" It would not seem to require one instant's deliberation in an American Senate to insure the indignant rejection of this disgraceful and humiliating proposition. Yet there are influences at work to induce the administration to so degrade us in the eyes of the world and in our own self-respect as to yield to the insolent demand of England, and abandon our case in this shameful manner. There are some interests selfish enough-some trading Americans unworthy enough to be willing to sacrifice the honor of the nation for mercenary considerations. The unwholesome bubble of Wall street speculation, inflated now to an unnatural and dangerous size, and threatened at any noment with a sudden collapse, clamors for the infamous surrender in order to prevent the simultaneous downfall of the treaty and the market. The claimants of direct damwho have been careful swell their demands to a capacity sufficient to cover the expenses of lobbyists and to meet the necessities of corruptionists, are pressing on the Senate the consummation of this national disgrace. Commercial fossils and charlatans-not the bone and sinew of the commerce of the country-meet in a packed convention, engineered by lobby agents in the pay of the direct claimants, and deplore the loss of the treaty as a great public calamity. but have no word to say in deprecation of the loss of our national honor. The patriotism of such men is in their money chests, and the President and the Senate what value to put advice. Because the rejection of the supplemental treaty might for the moment depress the market value of our securities they under the heels of England. They have not the courage to feel that we are growing to be independent of the English market, nor the sense to remember that ever since the termination of the rebellion, although the Alabama claims have been unsettled and under agitation, our securieties have been steadily advancing. We have good and true friends in Germany, and the intrinsic value of our bonds defies the intrigues English capitalists. The destruction of the Treaty of Washington will not lead to war, and while we are at peace Englishmen have sufficient avarice to secure our five and six per cents for their money and sufficient udgment to know that our national wealth is increasing with every succeeding year. The selfish arguments of these interested advocates of the supplemental infamy will not prevail with President Grant, and should not be heeded by the Senate. Behind the Wall street speculators, the direct claimants, the lobbyists and the commercial fossils, stand a watchful and a jealous people-a people who care nothing for the Washington Treaty or the English threats, but much for the national honor and self-respect-a people who demand from the administration the immediate and unconditional rejection of the English proposal for the unconditional withdrawal of the American case from before the Geneva Tribunal.

No party issue at this important moment should be suffered to interfere with the interests of the nation. In the whole of the controversy forced upon us by England, President Grant has himself occupied a firm and dignified position, and the weakness and vacillation evident in some of our acts are not due to him. The despatches of Secretary Fish, speaking the sentiments and determination of the President, have consistently maintained our right to advance our claims for special damages and our resolution not to withdraw them. The acts of Secretary Fish suggesting and inviting surrender, instead of breaking off negotiations by a distinct declaration of our intention not to abandon our case, have been his own. The President very properly referred the supplemental rule to the Senators for their consideration and advice, but he has given no indication of his own readiness to disgrace the country by its acceptance. We call upon him to reject it. As a supporter of his administration up to this point, we assure him that destruction must follow this humiliating and infamous surrender to the bluster and threats of England. Political considerations should not be suffered to influence or control a question of grave national importance; nevertheless the voice and wishes of the people in a republican government must be heard and obeyed. The government of the United States ought to be the embodiment of the popular sentiment, or it becomes false to the trust it has accepted. The nation trembles on the verge of an unconditional surrender of its honor, its manhood and its selfrespect, and the independent press would be faithless to its duty if it should to warn the administration that it cannot make the sacrifice without entailing destruction upon itself. Ninety-nine hundredths of the people, from Maine to California, would blush with shame at the national disgrace and with indignation against those who had been its instruments. General Grant, who has saved the republic so recently and whose sword is ever ready to be drawn in its defence, is not likely to dishonor it in the eyes of the world by a cowardly surrender to foreign Power. We call upon him to withdraw this supplemental treaty from the Senate and to reject it of his own act. We call his friends and opponents in the Senate to unite in advising such a course. Let the treaty be destroyed, for the people care nothing about it, and the country will not suffer from its loss; but let the nation's honor be preserved, and the administration will find its reward in the plaudits of a proud and

THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION at Rochester vesterday adjourned over till to-day, after passing a short but pithy series of resolutions, which practically pledge the support of New York at Baltimore to Greeley. Governor Hoffman is reported to have triumphantly "bossed" the gathering, and he has apparently heartily thrown in his lot with the Philosopher of Chappaqua. The selection of Mr. Kinsella, who accepted the Cincinnati candidate from the first, as both temporary and permanent Chairman, is significant of the temper of the Convention. Some of the Bourbons are measy and restless, but the young men have got control of the party, and what can they do? It has been decided, also, that the vote of New York at Baltimore shall be east as a unit—a very important feature in the fight that may take place there, when the numerical importance of the Empire State is remembered. The Tammany delegation from this city were admitted and the reformers rejected, owing, it is charged, to the curious generalship of Mr. Tilden, who was a member of both delegations, and did not know exactly which he preferred should be awarded seats. In consequence of this unexpected result Mr. Tilden is to be read out of the Apollo Hall party, and there is considerable indignation being cultivated among the country members against him.

IT IS JOHN BULL'S INTEREST to have the Ala-

pama discussion closed, not ours. We can bide our Ame. No LATER AGO THAN MAY 8 Secretary Fish wrote to Minister Schenck:-"All the propositions made by the British government involve covertly, probably without design, what this government cannot agree tonamely, the withdrawal from the vince of the tribunal what we believe to be entirely within their competence. I need not repeat our conviction that the arbitrators have the right to decide whether the claims to which Great Britain objects are or are not admissible." In the same despatch the Secretary says:-"In my telegram of yesterday I explained that the President cannot and will not withdraw any point of what has been submitted within his construction of the intent and spirit of the treaty." Is it consistent with these positive declarations for the President to swallow the "humble pie" prepared for him by England in the supplemental rule dictated by the British government, which says "the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, consents that he will make no claim on the part of the United States in respect of indirect losses as aforesaid before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva?" John Bull not only requires us to eat his "humble pie," but our own words as

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION at Elmira completed their labors yesterday with military promptness. The rumors floating about to the effect that there would be a Greeley demonstration of greater or less importance were not verified. Everything went smoothly for the Grant men from the very outset, and the adherents of the administration can at least congratulate themselves upon the splendid discipline of what remains to them of the party which they control. The great feature of the Convention was the resolutions, which seem to have been written upon the same principle that regulated the composition of the Psalms-that is, saying everything twice over in different verbal forms. They are a wonderful example of literary diffuseness, and are not only a text for stump speeches, but a stump speech in themselves. Mr. Henry R. Pierson was chairman of the Convention.

THE SECRETS OF THE SENATORIAL EXECUTIVE Sessions are not too secure. The name of every Senator who supports the infamous surrender of the national honor demanded by the English government will be placed before the

REFERRING TO ENGLAND'S REBEL DEBT CLAIM, the American mouthpiece says :-Immediately on its presentation the United States remonstrated, and requested the British government to instruct their agent to withdraw that claim. Their remonstrance was unheeded; their request was not answered.

England's requests and remonstrances about consequential damages seem to have been differently met, as the following extract

The President of the United States, by and with he advice and consent of the Senate thereof, con-ents that he will make no claim on the part of the Inited States in respect of indirect losses as afore-aid before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva. It seems like the result of a contest between

a shark and a jelly-fish.

Rapid Transit Bills for the City-Railroad Bills in the Governor

Our State legislators at Albany have adjourned for the season and departed for their several homes. It is not our intention at present to review the past session. If they think they have done well we know they might and ought to have done better. In one essential particular they have failed, and failed most lamentably, to meet the wants and necessities of the citizens of New York. In the matter of rapid transit, the crying necessity of the hour, the duty of both houses was plain; but, from causes best known to our representatives themselves, the duty has not been discharged. In spite of our boasted American enterprise there is no large city within the limits of modern civilization so badly off for rapid transit as the city of New York.

Two bills, both of them having for their object rapid transit, and both of them passed both houses, are now in the Governor's hands. Their fate, while we write, is uncertain. One of these bills is Vanderbilt's Rapid Transit: the other is Gilbert's elevated scheme. We have already and more than once commented on Vanderbilt's plan. It is better than nothing, no doubt; but the proposed railroad which is to give us a rapid run from City Hall to Fifty-ninth street, at the rate of ten cents a head, is merely an extension of the existing Vanderbilt lines; and whatever gain there will be in the affair will be more a gain to Vanderbilt than to the community. Of the Gilbert elevated railroad we can only say that it is a very reasonable experiment. Neither the one nor the other comes up to the high requirements of the case. What we want and what the people of New York really need is two railroads for steam cars-the one running from the lower part of the city to Harlem Bridge on the one side, the other running from the lower part of the city to Kingsbridge on the other side-the fare, in either case, not exceeding six cents. To this plan we must ultimately come. Nothing else will

What the Governor may do we know not. It is said that he is in favor of Vanderbilt's plan. In our judgment the Commodore could do much better. He is known all over the world as a great railroad man, and he requires but to make the call in a great enterprise, such as that which the HERALD recommends, to command the necessary funds. As it is he has not come up to the high requirements of the occasion. It is not improbable that the Governor may sign his bill. So far as the extension will be a gain to Mr. Vanderbilt we make no objection, but we insist that in signing this bill the Governor should know that he is not conferring any boon on the community. He will be advancing the interests of Mr. Vanderbilt, not the interests of the citizens of New York. Of the possible or probable fate of the Gilbert elevated railroad we know nothing. Suffice that the one scheme and the other are, in our judgment, totally inadequate, and that they do not remove the great existing necessity for two viaduct railroads for the use of the residents of New York.

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE have done many foolish things, but never anything so utterly foolish as their action yesterday.

SECRETARY FISH WROTE TO OUR MINISTER IN LONDON on May 4, "The President cannot consent to any proposition which, by implication or inference, withdraws any part of the claims or of the case of this government from consideration of the tribunal." And again, the same date, he wrote, "Under these circumstances the President is compelled to adhere to the opinion that it is within the province of the arbitrators at Geneva to consider all the claims, and to determine the liability of Great Britain for all the claims which have been put forward by the United States."

What change has occurred to render it possible for the President now to say, in a rule of the Treaty of Washington added at the dictation of England, "The President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, consents that he will make no claim on the part of the United States in respect of indirect losses as aforesaid before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva?"

Humble Pie for Brother Jonathan.

"In consideration thereof the President OF THE UNITED STATES. BY AND WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE THEREOF, CONSENTS THAT HE WILL MAKE NO CLAIM ON THE PART OF THE UNITED STATES IN RESPECT OF INDIRECT LOSSES AS AFORESAID BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF ARBITRATION AT GENEVA.

The above is the dish of humble pie placed before the United States by the English government through Lord Granville, with a request that they eat it without making wry faces. What say our American people to the invitation?

Let us have no more secret diplomatic negotiations, but honest, fair, open dealing, which can lead to no mistakes.

THE RE-ELECTION OF SENATOR FERRY Yesterday will doubtless be regarded by the liberals as a significant victory. Senator Ferry was one of the earliest opponents at Washington of the administration, and though for a time he was comparatively guarded in his utterances he has lately clearly defined his position. His re-election has been gained by a fusion of democrats and liberals, and the success that has crowned this policy may lead to many similar combinations in the future. His opponent, Governor Hawley, was one of the most popular politicians in his State, and one of the hardest workers, too. The defeat has not certainly been the result of a negligent canvass or of lack of personal in-

SENATOR CHANDLER, OF MICHIGAN, IS NOT OVER FOND of the British. How can he face the sturdy Americans of the West if he should vote to advise the President to abandon the indirect claims before the Geneva Conference at the insolent bidding of John Bull?

SENATOR CONKLING IS FROM THE STATE OF New York and is a supporter of the administration. Will he venture to advise President Grant to back down from the position taken by the United States government, and, at the bidding of John Bull, to sign the following humiliating declaration?-"The President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, consents that he will make no claim on the part of the United States in respect of indirect losses as aforesaid before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva?"

THE FANCY STOCKS ON WALL STREET AND duly inflated. The bubble of speculation is full to bursting, and may collapse at any moment. This is the reason Wall street desires the nation to disgrace itself by the abandonment of the American Geneva. They will fail, and then let all prudent men stand from under.

THE DEMOCRATS NOW IN SESSION ROCHESTER have a splendid opportunity before them. Let them denounce in strong and indignant terms the insult offered to the national honor by the proposition of Lord Granville requiring the President and Senate to surrender unconditionally to the demands of England and to abandon their case before the Geneva Conference.

SECRETARY FISH MADE A SUGGESTION FOR A Compromise with England on April 27, but wrote, "Should a proposal to this effect be made by the British government the President will assent to it, it being understood that there is no withdrawal of any part of the American case, but an agreement not to demand damages on account of the claims referred to, leaving the tribunal to make such expression of opinion as it may think proper on that sub-

How does this "no withdrawal" declaration tally with the proposed supplemental rule of the Treaty of Washington, as demanded by the English, which says "in consideration thereof the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, consents that he will make no claim on the part of the United States in respect of indirect losses as aforesaid before the Tribunal of Arbitration at Geneva.

LORD GRANVILLE SAID TO OUR MINISTER AT London on May 9:-"I carefully avoid anything like menace; but, in consequence of the views and information you have presented to me yesterday and to-day, I take an unfavorable view of the chances of any settlement." After he had thus shaken his diplomatic fist under our republican nose on May 9 he prepared us his dish of "humble pie" on May 10, and Secretary Fish, at least, seemed not unwilling to eat it.

How Our Bobadil Government Talks ENGLAND—"These claims of an enormous and in-definite amount are not within the province of the arbitration."

AMERICA—"It is within your personal knowledge tion."

"It is within your personal knowledge is government has never expected or desired reasonable pecuniary compensations on their

nable pecuniary comper

ENGLAND-"I carefully avoid anything like menace, but"—
AMERICA—"The President will, therefore, be willing to consider, and, if possible, will present for the
consideration of the Senate any new article which
may be proposed by the British government."—
Extracts from the Treaty Correspondence.

This piece of conversation speaks volumes for American backbone-pliable as that of a

PRINCE BISMARCK HAS DECLARED HIS CONviction that the Americans were justified in their positive refusal to obey the haughty command of England to abandon their case as submitted to the Geneva Tribunal. What would our German fellow citizens think of an administration that, after repeated professions of determination not to back down, should eat British "humble pie," and consent to withdraw their case?

THE IRISH VOTE, ALTHOUGH CLAIMED FOR GREELEY, is very likely to be cast for Grant. But what will the Fenians say if the administration should tremble before Granville's threats and agree at his dictation to abandon their claims for indirect damages before the Geneva Tribunal?

GEORGE OPDYKE SAYS THAT THE FAILURE of the Treaty of Washington would be a great public calamity. Does he think it no "public calamity" to sacrifice the national honor and manhood?

THE STATE DEPARTMENT IS INCENSED AT THE EXCLUSIVE publication in yesterday's Henald of the diplomatic correspondence on the Washington Treaty difficulty. They believe the publication will defeat the supplemental rule. This shows that they are aware that the wishes of the people are against the disgraceful surrender of the national honor.

AMUSEMENTS.

Union Square Theatre.

A decided hit has been made at this theatre by the Vokes family, whose characteristic performance entitled "Belles of the Kitchen" has attracted crowded audiences ever since their first appearcrowded audlences ever since their first appearance in this city. But it is nearly time that they should be seen in some other of their numerous sketches. They are unquestionably talented artists in their line, and display a wonderful amount of versatility from the beginning to the end of their exceedingly humorous entertainment. The farce "Roland for an Oliver," in which the graceful and painstaking actress, Miss Fanny Hayward, appeared as Maria Darlington, and E. F. Thovne as Highlyer, preceded the performance, which altogether seemed to give great satisfaction.

The Old Bowery was crowded on Monday night from pit dome to witness the appearance of Mr. Albert W. Aiken as Royal Keene, in "The Witches of New York." Judging from the hearty manner in which he was applauded this gentleman has suc-ceeded in pleasing the sometimes hypercritical pat-rons of the "Drury." Charles Foster, as Abraham, the diamond broker, was keenly appreciated, and Miss Sacket as Kate Blake was well received.

Sharpley's Minstrels.

Sam Sharpley's troupe seem destined to successfully follow in the footsteps of the San Franciscos, at their old hall. A very full house greeted them on Monday night, and they were constantly encored. Nelse Seymour's "Dolly Varden" was the hit of the opening portion of the programme, while several of the songs and ballads were deservedly applauded.

Lina Edwin's Theatre.

A very excellent farce and vaudeville performance is being furnished at this theatre at present, which, without being particularly novel in any of its features, combines several very pleasing acts. In the two farces which are the beginning and ending of the entertainment Mr. G. F. Ketchum appears to considerable advantage, his droil humor and great facial expression causing roars of laughter. Of the other performers who appear in the oilo the character vocalism of Miss Blanche Selwyn, the ballad singing of Clara Fisher and O'Reardon's musical performances on tumblers are the most interesting, while the rest are to be credited with an earnest attempt to render their performances amusing. which, without being particularly novel in any of

Marietta Ravel appeared Monday evening in the spectacular piece entitled "Jartine, the Pride of th ourteenth." in which she sustained five different characters. "Jartine" is one mass of rank non-sense, but gives ample scope to Miss Ravel's pecu-liar line of acting. Her enforts were rewarded with liberal applianse by a large and noisy audience. The other characters were represented by Mr. T. W. Keene, Mr. A. W. Sheldon and others.

Irving Hall-Miss Nininger's Concert.

This favorite pupil of Signor Albites had a com-plimentary concert at Irving Hall on Tuesday plimentary concert at Irving Hall on Tuesday, night, at which she sang "Bel Raggio," from Rossini's "Semiramide," and in a couple of iduets and the quartet from "Rigoletto," She was assisted by Madame Gazzaniga, Miss Agnes Palimer, Miss, Adelaide Manzocchi, and Messrs. Leoni, Bartlett Ablites and Korbay. Miss Nininger proposes starting shortly for Italy, where she will complete he musical education under the best masters. She has given many evidences this season of a high order of talent, which, with careful training, will likely place her among the foremost of American artists.